

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated May 17, 2006, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

In response to the objection presented in Section 2 on page 2 of the action, the misspelling pointed out by the examiner has been corrected.

In order to advance prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the contribution of the invention over the prior art. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the steam production base includes a water reservoir and that the vessel for recovering juices is removable from the water reservoir and is adapted to be placed on the water reservoir. The recitation that the vessel is removable from the reservoir was already implicitly stated in claim 1 by the recitation that the vessel for recovering juices is "adapted to be placed on said steam production base" and by the disclosure at page 9, line 10, that the steam production base comprises the water reservoir.

The rejection presented in Section 5 of the action is traversed for the reason that the steam cooker now defined

in claim 1 is not suggested by any combination of the teachings of the applied references. In particular, neither reference discloses a vessel for recovering juices that is removable from an underlying water reservoir. In Whitenack, the component that may receive juices from cooking element 50 is water tray 30, whose primary function is to supply water to the steam chamber. In other words, water tray 30 of Whitenack constitutes the only water reservoir in the device disclosed in that reference. In this respect, Kincannon does not supply the deficiencies in the disclosure of Whitenack.


Thus, neither applied reference discloses a cooker that includes a vessel for recovering juices that is structurally separate from a water reservoir, from which it follows that amended claim 1 must be considered to clearly distinguish in an unobvious manner over any reasonable combination of the teachings of those references.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the prior art rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, that all of the pending claims be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/730,893
Amd. dated September 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2006

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 

Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:nlw
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\seb\ Dumoux3\pto\2006-09-18-amendment.doc